

**To:** Basso, Ray[Basso.Ray@epa.gov]  
**From:** Debbie Mans  
**Sent:** Mon 1/27/2014 4:38:02 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Job numbers

Thanks again.

Deborah A. Mans, Baykeeper & Executive Director

NY/NJ Baykeeper

52 W. Front Street

Keyport, NJ 07735

732.888.9870 ext. 2

732.888.9873 fax

Website: [www.nynjbaykeeper.org](http://www.nynjbaykeeper.org)

Follow us at:



Protecting, preserving, and restoring the Hudson-Raritan Estuary since 1989.

**From:** Basso, Ray [mailto:Basso.Ray@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, January 24, 2014 2:56 PM  
**To:** debbie@nynjbaykeeper.org  
**Subject:** FW: Job numbers

---

**From:** Basso, Ray  
**Sent:** Friday, January 24, 2014 12:44 PM

**To:** Plevin, Lisa  
**Subject:** Job numbers

Lisa, this thread is where we left the job numbers analysis from last spring. The last email contains the numbers I calculated with Walters caveat to follow. Call me if we need to discuss further.

---

**From:** Mugdan, Walter

**Sent:** Thursday, April 18, 2013 2:06 PM  
**To:** Basso, Ray; Plevin, Lisa  
**Cc:** Yeh, Alice; Mugdan, Walter  
**Subject:** RE: Jobs numbers

The one caveat I would offer is that other Superfund contexts we cite the number of jobs created in a given year. (For example, we say that the SF program in R2 was responsible for 4129 jobs in 2012 -- see attached.)

Ray has sensibly estimated the jobs over the life of the Passaic project under the different scenarios. Because the more extensive alternatives will continue for a much longer time period, the overall jobs impact of those alternatives is much greater. But it would not be correct to compare, say, the 3000 jobs associated with the "Capping with Some Dredging" alternative to the 4000+ jobs we estimated for the SF program in 2012. The one year estimate for that Passaic Alternative is 500.

---

**From:** Basso, Ray  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 18, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** Plevin, Lisa  
**Cc:** Mugdan, Walter; Yeh, Alice  
**Subject:** RE: Jobs numbers

I would say yes, unless Walter or Alice identifies an issue. Keep in mind that these numbers are feasibility study estimates. You really can't "defend" the actual numbers at this stage. But you can use the numbers to demonstrate the relative difference between alternatives in terms of prospective job creation.

---

**From:** Plevin, Lisa  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 18, 2013 10:35 AM  
**To:** Basso, Ray  
**Cc:** Mugdan, Walter; Yeh, Alice  
**Subject:** RE: Jobs numbers

Thanks. Can we finalize today?

Lisa J Plevin

Chief of Staff

US EPA Region 2

(212) 637-5000

**From:** Basso, Ray  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 18, 2013 7:47 AM  
**To:** Plevin, Lisa  
**Cc:** Mugdan, Walter; Yeh, Alice  
**Subject:** FW: Jobs numbers

Lisa , this is a revised version of what we came up with in terms of estimated job creation resulting from the 3 active FFS alternatives and the CPG's proposed remedy. We used a range of between 350 and 500 jobs annually for the construction phase of these projects. For the FFS Deep Dredging and Capping alternatives, we used the higher end of the range or 500 jobs annually to reflect the size and infrastructure needs of these project. For both the EPA and CPG focused dredging alternatives we used 350 jobs annually. I need to check on few things before we finalize, but this is the approach we are going to use.

- Deep Dredging Alternative (9.7 M cu/yds) or 6,000 jobs over the 12 year duration of the project

- Capping with Some Dredging Alternative (4.3 M cu/yds) or 3,000 jobs over the 6 year project

- Focused Dredging and Capping Alternative ( 0.9M cu/yds) or 1,050 jobs over the 3 year project

- CPG Focused Dredging and Capping (0.45M cu/yds) or 700 jobs over an estimated 2 year timeframe.

Although the CPG's targeted remedy involves dredging about one half the volume of EPA's

focused dredging alternative we estimated a two year project duration. Let me know when you want to have further discussion on these estimates.